

REMARKS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated July 1, 2004 have been considered. New claims 16-25 are added, and claims 1-25 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1-15 are anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,212,640 to Abdelnur *et al.* (hereinafter "Abdelnur"). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations of the claims are taught by Abdelnur.

For example, claim 1 includes limitations of the file interface arrangement including a memory configured with program code that implements at least one non-standard extension to the NFS client protocol, and the Office Action does not show that Abdelnur teaches these limitations. The Office Action cites Abdelnur's figure 7, #715; however, there is no apparent indication, either in the figure or the accompanying text, that there is any extension to the NFS client protocol. Therefore, the Office Action fails to show that Abdelnur anticipates claim 1. If the rejection is maintained, a citation to teachings of Abdelnur for this limitation is respectfully requested.

The Office Action fails to show that Abdelnur anticipates claim 2 which includes limitations of an interceptor module coupled to the operating system and to the system bus, the interceptor module configured and arranged to intercept NFS-client calls from the NFS client application and send NFS-client calls to the processor arrangement via the system bus. Abdelnur appears to have no need for an interceptor module because an Abdelnur client makes an NFS API call, which is code executing on the processor. Thus, there is no need to "intercept" and "send" any call to a processor arrangement since Abdelnur's processor is already executing the API call.

Claim 3 includes further limitations of intercepting messages from a stream, and the Office Action fails to show a suggestion of these limitations. Those skilled in the art will recognize that a stream is "an abstraction referring to any flow of data from a source (or sender, producer) to a single sink (or receiver, consumer). A stream usually flows through a channel of some kind, as opposed to packets which may be addressed and routed independently, possibly to multiple recipients. Streams usually require some mechanism for establishing a channel or a "connection" between the sender and receiver." (see the "Free On-Line Dictionary of Computing (FOLDOC) at <http://foldoc.doc.ic.ac.uk/foldoc/index.html>).

In contrast, the cited section of Abdelnur teaches a client making API calls for NFS file access (col. 6, ll. 24-32). There is no apparent indication that Abdelnur in any way uses streams. Since the claim clearly sets forth an OS message stream and an interceptor module that intercepts NFS messages from the message stream, and Abdelnur does not suggest streams, the Office Action does not show the limitations of claim 3.

As to claims 4, 6, and 7, these claims include limitations that indicate different types of extensions to the NFS client protocol. Abdelnur's figure 2 shows an NFS client coupled to an NFS server, and figure 7 simply shows a computer coupled to a network. Furthermore, the accompanying text does not appear to suggest any non-standard extensions to the NFS client protocol. As with claim 1, the Office Action does not show that Abdelnur shows any extension to the NFS client protocol. Thus, there is also no showing of those particularly identified extensions.

Claim 5 includes limitations of the interceptor module being configured and arranged to intercept packets from the RPC layer of the operating system. In contrast, Abdelnur simply teaches that RPC calls are made by an NFS client. There is no apparent suggestion that Abdelnur's NFS RPC requests are in any way intercepted so that they handled differently from non-NFS RPC requests. Thus, claim 5 is not shown to be anticipated by Abdelnur.

Claim 8 is a method claim and includes some limitations similar to those in claims 1 and 2. Thus, claim 8 is not anticipated for at least the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 2. In addition, claim 8 includes limitations of sending non-NFS RPCs to the second network interface card; and performing non-NFS RPC protocol processing on the second network interface card. It is respectfully submitted that Abdelnur does not appear to show or suggest a second interface card, nor is any particular element of Abdelnur cited as teaching this limitation. Thus, the Office Action does not show that Abdelnur anticipates claim 8.


The process limitations of claims 9-14, which depend from claim 8, are similar to the limitations of claims 1-7. Therefore, the Office Action does not show that claims 9-14 are anticipated for the reasons set forth above for claim 8 and for claims 1-7.

Claim 15 is an apparatus claim. For limitations in claim 15 that are similar to those in claim 1, the Office Action does not show that Abdelnur teaches the limitations of claim 15. Furthermore, claim 15 is in means-plus-function format, and the Office Action fails to recite structure from the current specification thought to be taught by elements of Nguyen. Thus, if the rejection is maintained, an explanation of the relied upon structures and corresponding elements is respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the remarks set forth above.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274